RECEIVED

# Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

APR 5 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION CFFICE OF SECRETARY

FURTHER REPLY COMMENT	TS OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.	
Telephone Number Portability	DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL	
In the Matter	) CC Docket No. 95-116, DA 96-358	

#### SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.

James D. Ellis Robert M. Lynch David F. Brown 175 E. Houston Room 1254 San Antonio, TX 78205 (210) 351-3478

ATTORNEYS FOR SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.

Mary W. Marks J. Paul Walters One Bell Center Room 3558 St. Louis, MO 63101

ATTORNEY FOR SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

April 5, 1996

No. of Copies rec'd Od C List ABCOE

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTE	INTRODUCTION		
II.	DISCUSSION			
	A.	"NUMBER PORTABILITY" MEANS "SERVICE PROVIDER PORTABILITY"	2	
	В.	THE TECHNICAL METHOD OF NUMBER PORTABILITY IS NOT PRESCRIBED	3	
	C.	INTERIM APPROACHES WILL PERMIT COMPETITION TO PROCEED	6	
	D.	COST RECOVERY MUST BE COMPETITIVELY NEUTRAL AND RECOVERED FROM ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS	7	
	E.	THE LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS ARE INAPPLICABLE TO CMRS	7	
Ш	CONCLUSION		8	

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	CC Docket No. 95-116, DA 96-358
Telephone Number Portability	)	

#### FURTHER REPLY COMMENTS OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.

SBC Communications Inc. ("SBC"), on behalf of its subsidiaries, Southwestern

Bell Telephone Company ("SWBT") and Southwestern Bell Mobile Systems, Inc. ("SBMS"),

files these further reply comments pursuant to the Commission's notice released March 14, 1996.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

As has been pointed out by numerous parties, the enactment of The Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Telecommunications Act")<sup>1</sup> requires the examination of no new issues in this Docket; however, the Telecommunications Act clarifies the Commission's course on certain important issues:

- (1) "Number portability" means "service provider portability."<sup>2</sup>
- (2) Local exchange carriers ("LECs") are under the express duty "to provide, to the extent technically feasible, number portability in accordance with the requirements prescribed by the Commission."<sup>3</sup>
- (3) Interim solutions such as remote call forwarding ("RCF") and direct inward dialing trunks ("DID") are deemed sufficient under the Telecommunications Act to permit

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For purposes of consistency, all references to what is or will become Title 47 of the United States Code, either as it exists under The Communications Act of 1934 (the "Communications Act"), as amended (47 U.S.C. §§151, et seq.), or under The Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Pub. L. No.104-104; 110 Stat. 56 (1996)), will be referenced by their codified section numbers (e.g., "Section 151" or "Section 272").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Section 153(30).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Section 251(b)(2).

competition to proceed until the implementation of the Commission's regulations relating to a long-term solution.<sup>4</sup>

- (4) The cost of establishing number portability is to be borne by all "telecommunications carriers" on a competitively neutral basis to be determined by the Commission.<sup>5</sup>
- (5) Commercial Mobile Radio Service ("CMRS") number portability need not be included within the scope of the Commission's order in this Docket.<sup>6</sup>

The Telecommunications Act charges the Commission with the duty to exercise jurisdiction over numbering and to establish requirements for number portability and its cost recovery mechanism.<sup>7</sup>

The Commission should embrace its leadership role and adopt rules that permit the industry to implement number portability efficiently.

#### II. DISCUSSION

### A. "NUMBER PORTABILITY" MEANS "SERVICE PROVIDER PORTABILITY"

As SBC and others point out, number portability is limited to the ability of an end user customer to retain the number associated with its existing service at the same location when changing service providers.<sup>2</sup> Very few commenters disagree. Although New York State

The term "number portability" means the ability of users of telecommunications services to retain, at the same location, existing telecommunications numbers without impairment of quality, reliability, or convenience when switching from one telecommunications carrier to another.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xi).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Section 251(e)(2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>See Sections 153(26) and 251(b)(2) (definition and obligations of LECs).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Sections 251(b)(2) and (e)(1-2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>See Section 153(3):

Department of Public Service ("NYSDPS"), for instance, proposes that the Commission's final rules on portability should permit consumers to retain their telephone numbers if they move anywhere within an incumbent's rate center, 9 the Commission cannot adopt rules to implement the NYSDPS suggestion. Congress was specific in its definition of number portability as service provider portability only. The Commission's order in this Docket cannot create a greater burden than Congress intended. The Commission cannot adopt rules to require location (or service) portability in addition to the service provider portability intended by Congress.

### B. THE TECHNICAL METHOD OF NUMBER PORTABILITY IS NOT PRESCRIBED

Congress has mandated that all LECs provide service provider number portability to the extent technically feasible. As pointed out by SBC in its Further Comments, <sup>10</sup> any long-term number portability solution should be developed by the industry in response to end-user customer demand and not by carrier demand or regulatory mandate. Bell Atlantic<sup>11</sup> and BellSouth<sup>12</sup> concur that permitting the industry to work out the details for a long-term portability solution is important.

Several commenting parties argue that the Commission should adopt in this rulemaking the Local Routing Number ("LRN") proposal as "the" permanent long-term local

Id. See also NYNEX Further Comments at 2; OPASTCO Further Comments at 3; Pacific Bell Further Comments at 6; Omnipoint Further Comments at 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>NYSDPS Further Comments at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>SBC Further Comments at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Bell Atlantic Further Comments at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>BellSouth Further Comments at 7-9.

LRN is the only technical solution available and that all of the necessary technical details and questions related to LRN have been resolved. These commenters would have the Commission believe that LRN can be implemented in a short period of time. Some Commenters have even gone so far as to establish timelines for implementation of LRN, generally in 1997.<sup>14</sup>

There exists no consensus, however, that LRN or any other single method of number portability is the correct technical response to Congress' mandate. Although during the past few months some of the technical difficulties of LRN have been resolved, many issues must still be resolved before a timeline or date certain can be established for long-term portability. While LRN may ultimately prove to be "the" viable long-term solution, it is still in the trial phase. It would be premature for the Commission to adopt LRN as the permanent long-term solution, as some commenters suggest.

Importantly, LRN is not the only long-term technical solution being considered by the industry; other technical alternatives also hold promise, including Release-To-Pivot ("RTP") and Query-On-Release ("QOR"). MCI argues that the RTP and QOR proposals are anti-competitive routing schemes because they supposedly will not treat all calls the same. MCI opines, therefore, that RTP and QOR must be summarily rejected in this proceeding. MCI assertions are premature, however, because the industry continues to evaluate the technical details

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>AT&T Further Comments at 2-3; ALTS Further Comments at 4; CCTA Further Comments at 3; Teleport Further Comments at 7-8; MCI Further Comments at 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>See AT&T Further Comments at 8; Time Warner Further Comments at 10.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup>MCI Further Comments at 8-9.

and potential benefits of RTP and QOR. The determination of the feasibility of RTP and QOR as possible elements of a long-term solution is far from complete.

While some parties opine that Section 251 (d)(1) of the Telecommunications Act requires the Commission to establish rules to implement a long-term number portability solution within six months of enactment, <sup>16</sup> in fact, Section 251 (d)(1) does not require the Commission to adopt, within six months, a specific form of long-term number portability. The Commission is only required within this time frame to outline the principles for a long-term solution. The Commission can then permit the industry to resolve the required technical specifications.

As USTA and others advocate,<sup>17</sup> the Commission should rely upon the industry to determine the appropriate long-term solution. The chosen solution should then be implemented in accordance with the Telecommunications Act, "to the extent technically feasible." The Commission should not rush to judgment, particularly when Congress has recognized the viability of the existing interim solutions.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup>AT&T Further Comments at 1; TCG Further Comments at 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup>GTE Further Comments at 9-10; Pacific Bell Further Comments at 2-4; SBC Further Comments at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>See, e.g., Section 271(c)(2)(B)(xi).

## C. INTERIM APPROACHES WILL PERMIT COMPETITION TO PROCEED

approach such as LRN will satisfy the Telecommunications Act's mandate for number portability. These commenters cite the Telecommunications Act's definition of "number portability," but ignore the language of the Competitive Checklist, which states in pertinent part:

Until the date by which the Commission issues regulations pursuant to section 251 to require number portability, interim telecommunications number portability through remote call forwarding, direct inward dialing trunks, or other comparable arrangements, with as little impairment of functioning, reliability, and convenience as possible. After that date, full compliance with such regulations.<sup>21</sup>

Congress, through Section 271, endorses interim solutions as sufficient to support the introduction of competition until the Commission establishes requirements for long-term number portability and those requirements are implemented.<sup>22</sup> The Commission should not be swayed by a misreading of the Telecommunications Act and should adopt DID and RCF as interim solutions pursuant to clear statutory language and Congressional intent.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup>Cox Enterprises Further Comments at 6, Omnipoint Further Comments at 3, California Cable Television Association Further Comments at 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup>Section 153(30).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup>Section 271 (c)(2)(B)(xi) (emphasis added).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup>Other commenters recognized this distinction that seemed to escape the referenced parties. Ameritech Further Comments at 6; USTA Further Comments at 2; GTE Further Comments at 8; Pacific Bell Further Comments at 6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup>Although some commenters would lead the Commission to believe that the window of opportunity for BOCs to fulfill the Competitive Checklist will close when the Commission adopts its regulations, presumably the Commission will permit all LECs, including BOCs, a phased-in implementation schedule for the long-term number portability solution. To the extent a BOC meets the Commission's number portability requirements, it will meet that element of the Competitive

# D. COST RECOVERY MUST BE COMPETITIVELY NEUTRAL AND RECOVERED FROM ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS

Virtually all commenters referenced the competitively neutral cost recovery language of the Telecommunications Act. <sup>24</sup> Given the contentious nature of this issue and the significant impact it will have on all telecommunications providers, <sup>25</sup> SBC concurs with those parties advocating that the Commission adopt an expedited, focused FNPRM that specifically addresses the development of a national approach for recovery of long-term number portability costs on a competitively neutral basis. <sup>26</sup> Any approach ultimately adopted must be in place coincident with deployment of the long-term solution so that LECs are allowed to begin to recover all related costs as they are incurred. <sup>27</sup> To do otherwise would fail the competitive neutrality test and would run counter to legislative intent.

## E. THE LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS ARE INAPPLICABLE TO CMRS

With one confusing exception, no commenter suggested that the instant Docket, or its subsequent associated dockets, should apply in any respect to commercial mobile radio service ("CMRS") providers. The comments of PCIA in this regard are perplexing. On the one hand,

Checklist, as well. See, e.g., ALTS Further Comments at 2-3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup>Section 251 (e)(2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup>Pacific Bell estimates the cost of implementing LRN at approximately \$1B over three years. Pacific Bell Further Comments at 7-8. NYNEX expects the final costs associated with a long-term solution to surpass by a wide margin the costs for 800 portability. NYNEX Further Comments at 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup>Ameritech Further Comments at 2; BellSouth Further Comments at 9; NYNEX Further Comments at 4; ALTS Further Comments at 6-7; MFS Further Comments at 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup>Bell Atlantic Further Comments at 1-2; NYNEX Further Comments at 3-4.

PCIA argues that the Telecommunications Act does not require, and the Commission should not impose, interim number portability requirements on CMRS providers.<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, PCIA argues that broadband CMRS should be included in any long-term number portability requirement, while it has reservations about including narrowband CMRS and SMR services in a long term solution.<sup>29</sup> PCIA also attempts to have the Commission categorize only broadband PCS providers as LECs. PCIA's stance is not only inconsistent with the Telecommunications Act, it is also inconsistent with the Commission's intent to treat equally all providers classified as CMRS.

Moreover, as stated by BellSouth, the record in this Docket makes it clear that wireless providers should not be required to participate in number portability solutions and CMRS providers should not be burdened with number portability requirements.<sup>30</sup>

#### III. CONCLUSION

Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act charges the Commission with the duty to exercise jurisdiction over numbering issues and to establish requirements for number portability and the recovery of its cost. The Commission should be guided by certain principles in its pursuit of number portability solutions. First, as SBC and others point out, number portability is limited to the ability of an end user customer to retain the number associated with its existing service at

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup>PCIA Further Comments at 1-2 ("... the obligation to provide number portability is imposed only on local exchange carriers [citing Section 251(b)(2)]--a category that presumptively does not include CMRS" (citing Section 153(26) (a)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup>PCIA Further Comments at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup>BellSouth Further Comments at 6-7. This position was also voiced by Bell Atlantic/ NYNEX Mobile Further Comments at 2; SBC Further Comments at 3; AirTouch Further Comments at 4-5.

the same location when changing service providers. Second, while LECs are required to implement number portability to the extent technically feasible, there exists no consensus that any particular method of number portability is the correct technical response to Congress' mandate. The Commission should, therefore establish requirements that the industry can use to derive the required technical specifications. Third, the Telecommunications Act expressly endorses the use of interim solutions as sufficient to support the introduction of competition until the Commission establishes requirements for long-term number portability and those requirements are implemented. Fourth, the Commission should address number portability cost recovery through an expedited, focused FNPRM that specifically addresses the development of a national, competitively neutral approach. Any cost recovery approach adopted must be invoked coincident with deployment of the long-term solution to permit LECs to recover their costs on a timely, competitively neutral basis. Fifth, CMRS providers should not be burdened with number portability requirements.

As pointed out by SBC in its Further Comments, any long-term number portability solution the Commission adopts should be developed by the industry in response to end-user customer demand and not by carrier demand or regulatory mandate. The Commission should embrace the authority the Telecommunications Act grants and adopt rules that permit the industry to implement both interim and long-term number portability solutions in an efficient, cost-effective, and competitively neutral manner.

#### SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.

BY:

James D. Ellis
Robert M. Lynch
David F. Brown
175 E. Houston
Room 1254
San Antonio, TX 78205
(210) 351-3478

ATTORNEYS FOR SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.

Mary W. Marks J. Paul Walters One Bell Center Room 3558 St. Louis, MO 63101

ATTORNEY FOR SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

April 5, 1996

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Cheryl C. Jones, hereby certify that copies of FURTHER REPLY COMMENTS OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC., CC Docket 95-116, have been served by first class United States mail, postage prepaid, on the parties listed on the attached.

Cheryl 6. Jones
Cheryl C. Jones

April 5, 1996

Werner K. Hartenberger, Esq.
Laura H. Phillips, Esq.
J.G. Harrington, Esq.
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
Ad Hoc Coalition of Competitive Carriers
1255 Twenty-third St., N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mark Stachiw, Esq.
AirTouch Paging
Three Forest Plaza
12221 Merit Drive, Suite 800
Dallas, Texas 75251

Larry A. Peck, Esq.
Frank Michael Panek, Esq.
Ameritech
Room 4H86
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Robert M. Gurss, Esq.
Wiles, Artis, Hedrick & Lane, Chartered
Association of Public-Safety Communications
Officials-International, Inc.
1666 K Street, N.W., #1100
Washington, D.C. 20006

John M. Goodman, Esq. Betsy L. Anderson, Esq. Bell Atlantic 1133 20th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 Carl W. Northrop, Esq.
E. Ashton Johnston, Esq.
Arch Communications Group
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
10th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400

Charles H. Helein, Esq.
Helein & Associates, P.C.
America's Carriers Telecommunication Association
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 700
McLean, Virginia 22102

Richard J. Metzger
General Counsel
Association for Local Telecommunications Services
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 560
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mark C. Rosenblum, Esq. John J. Langhauser, Esq. Clifford K. Williams, Esq. Attorneys for At&T Room 3244J1 295 North Maple Avenue Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

John T. Scott, III, Esq. Crowell & Moring Bell Atlantic NYNEX Mobile, Inc. 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-2595 Alan J. Gardner, Esq.
Jerry Yanowitz, Esq.
Jeffery Sinsheimer, Esq.
Jennifer A. Johns, Esq.
California Cable Television Association
4341 Piedmont Avenue
Oakland, California 94611

Michael F. Altschul-Vice President and General Counsel Randall S. Coleman-Vice President, Regulatory Policy & Law Brenda K. Pennington-Staff Counsel Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association 1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 200 Washington, D.C. 20036

Danny E. Adams, Esq.
Steven A. Augustino, Esq.
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
The Competitive Telecommunications Association
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Cynthia B. Miller
Associate General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commision
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Room 301, General L. Gunter Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Emily C. Hewitt, Esq.
Vincent L. Crivella, Esq.
Michael J. Ettner, Esq.
Jody B. Burton, Esq.
General Services Administration
18th & F Streets, N.W., Room 4002
Washington, D.C. 20405

Donna N. Lampert, Esq. Christopher A. Holt, Esq. Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C. 701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20004

Genevieve Morelli
Vice President and General Counsel
The Competitive Telecommunications Association
1140 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 220
Washington, D.C. 20036

David C. Jatlow, Esq. Young & Jatlow The Ericsson Corporation 2300 N Street, N.W. Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20037

Kathy L. Shobert
Director, Federal Affairs
General Communication, Inc
901 15th St., NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005

John A. Malloy, Esq.
Vice President and General Counsel
Leo R. Fitzsimon, Esq.
GO Communications Corporation
201 N. Union Street, Suite 410
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

David J. Gudino, Esq. GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1200 Washington, D.C. 20036

Harold L. Stoller
Richard S. Wolters
Special Assistants Attorney General
Illinois Commerce Commission
527 East Capitol Avenue
P.O. Box 19280
Springfield, IL 62794-9280

Sam LaMartina, Esq.
ITN Legal & Regulatory Affairs
8500 W. 110th Street, Suite 600
Overland Park, KS 66210

Paul Glist, Esq.
Christopher W. Savage, Esq.
John C. Dodge, Esq.
Cole, Raywid & Braverman, L.L.P.
Jones Intercable, Inc.
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20006

Catherine R. Sloan, Esq.
Richard L. Fruchterman, Esq.
Richard S. Whitt, Esq.
Worldcom, Inc.
d/b/a LDDS WorldCom
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert C. Schoonmaker Vice President GVNW Inc./Management 2270 La Montana Way Colorado Springs, CO 80918

Robert M. Wienski ITN Business Development 8500 W. 110th Street, Suite 600 Overland Park, KS 66210

Edwin N. Lavergne, Esq.
Darren L. Nunn, Esq.
Ginsburg, Feldman and Bress, Chartered
Interactive Services Association
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

David L. Kahn c/o Bellatrix International 4055 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 415 Los Angeles, CA 90010

Richard F. Nelson, Chair Marion County Board of County Commissioners 9-1-1 System Support Department 2631 S.E. 3rd Street Ocala, Florida 34471-9101 Loretta J. Garcia, Esq.
Donald J. Elardo, Esq.
MCI Telecommunications Corporation
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Roger W. Steiner
Assistant General Counsel
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Daniel L. Brenner, Esq.
Neal M. Goldberg, Esq.
David L. Nicoll, Esq.
National Cable Television Association, Inc.
1724 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Richard A. Askoff, Esq.
National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.
100 South Jefferson Road
Whippany, New Jersey 07981

Joel H. Levy, Esq.
Cohn and Marks
National Wireless Resellers Association
1333 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036

Andrew D. Lipman, Esq.
Mark Sievers, Esq.
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered
MFS Communications Company, Inc.
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007

Paul Rodgers - General Counsel
Charles D. Gray - Assistant General Counsel
James Bradford Ramsay - Deputy Assistant General Counsel
National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
1102 ICC Building
Post Office Box 684
Washington, D.C. 20044

James R. Hobson, Esq.
Donelan, Cleary, Wood & Maser, P.C.
National Emergency Number Association
1100 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 750
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934

David Cosson, Esq.
L. Marie Guillory, Esq.
National Telephone Cooperative Association
2626 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Deborah Haraldson General Counsel New York State Department of Public Service Three Empire State Plaza Albany, NY 12223 Robert S. Foosaner -Senior Vice President
Government Affairs
Lawrence R. Krevor - Director-Government Affairs
Laura L. Holloway - General Attorney
Nextel Communications, Inc.
800 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1001
Washington, D.C. 20006

Maureen Thompson, Esq.
New England Telephone and Telegraph Company
New York Telephone Company
1095 Avenue of Americas
New York, N.Y. 10036

Mark J. O'Connor Piper & Marbury L.L.P. Omnipoint Corporation 1200 19th Street, N.W. Seventh Floor Washington, D.C. 20036 Lisa M. Zania
General Counsel
Organization for the Protection and Advancement
of Small Telephone Companies (OPASTCO)
21 Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20039

Stuart Polikoff
Regulatory and Legislative Analyst
Organization for the Protection and Advancement
of Small Telephone Companies (OPASTCO)
21 Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20039

Marlin D. Ard, Esq.
Nancy C. Woolf, Esq,
Pacific Bell
140 New Montgomery Street, Room 1523
San Francisco, CA 94105

Judith St. Ledger-Roty, Esq.
John W. Hunter, Esq.
Reed Smith Shaw & McCLay
Paging Network, Inc.
One Franklin Square
Suite 1100 East Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005

William L. Roughton, Jr., Esq. PCS PRIMECO, L.F. 1133 20th Street, N.W. Suite 850 Washington, D.C. 20036

Mark J. Golden
Vice President of Industry Affiars
500 Montgomery Street
Suite 700
Alexandria, VA 22314

R. Michael Senkowski, Esq.
Jeffrey S. Linder, Esq.
Stephen J. Rosen, Esq.
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
Personal Communications Industry Association
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Betty D. Montgomery
Attorney General of Ohio
Public Utilities Section
180 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

Mr. Rowland L. Curry
Mr. Pat Wood, III
Mr. Robert W. Gee
Ms. Judy Walsh
Public Utility Commission of Texas
7800 Shoal Creek Blvd.
Austin, Texas 78757

Jay C. Keithley, Esq.
Norina T. Moy, Esq.
Kent Y. Nakamura, Esq.
Sprint Corporation
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 1110
Washington, D.C. 20036

Margot Smiley Humphrey
Koteen & Naftalin
TDS Telecom
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036

Gregory M. Casey, Esq.
Victoria A. Schlesinger, Esq.
TELEMATION International, Inc.
6707 Democracy Boulevard
Betheseda, MD 20817

Duane W. Luckey - Section Chief Anne E. Henkener - Assistant Attorneys General Public Utilities Section 180 E. Broad Street Columbus, OH 43215-3793

Jere W. Glover, Esq.
Barry Pineles, Esq.
Office of Advocacy
United States Small Business Administration
409 Third Street, S.W.
Suite 7800
Washington, D.C. 20416

Peter Arth, Jr., Esq.
Edward W. O'Neill, Esq.
Ellen S. Levine, Esq.
State of California and the Public Utilities
Commission of the State of California
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Charles C. Hunter, Esq.
Kevin S. DiLallo, Esq.
Hunter & Mow, P.C.
Telecommunications Resellers Association
1620 I Street, N.W.
Suite 701
Washington, D.C. 20006

J. Manning Lee, Esq.
Teleport Communications Group, Inc.
Two Teleport Drive, Suite 300
Staten Island, N.Y. 10311

Glenn S. Richards, Esq.
Fisher Wayland Cooper Leader & Zaragoza L.L.P.
Teleservices Industry Association
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mary McDermott, Esq.
Linda Kent, Esq.
Charles D. Cosson, Esq.
U.S. Telephone Association
1401 H Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005

Jeffrey H. Olson, Esq.
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison
U.S. AirWaves Inc.
1615 L Street, N.W.
Suite 1300
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dan L. Poole, Esq.
Jeffrey S. Bork, Esq.
U S West, Inc.
1020 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036

William B. Barfield, Esq.
Jim O. Llewellyn, Esq.
BellSouth Corporation
Suite 1800
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3610

Brian Conboy, Esq.
Sue D. Blumenfeld, Esq.
Thomas Jones, Esq.
Willkie Far & Gallagher
Time Warner Communications Holdings, Inc.
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Pamela Portin
Director of External Affairs
U.S. Airwaves Inc.
10500 N.E. 8th St., Suite 625
Bellevue, Washington 98004

Stephen G. Kraskin, Esq. Thomas J. Moorman, Esq. Kraskin & Leese U.S. Intelco Networks, Inc. 2120 L Street, N.W. Suite 520 Washington, D.C. 20037

Albert Halprin, Esq.
Mellanie Haratunian, Esq.
Halprin, Temple, Goodman & Sugrue
Yellow Pages Publishers Association
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 650, East Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005

Thomas E. Taylor, Esq. Christopher J. Wilson, Esq. Frost & Jacobs Cincinnati Bell Telephone 2500 PNC Center 201 East Fifth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 Gordon F. Scherer
President and Chief Executive Officer
Scherers Communications Group, Inc.
575 Scherers Court
Worthington, OH 43085

Richard A. Muscat
Assistant Attorney General
Texas Advisory Commission on State Emergency
Communications
Consumer Protection Division
Public Agency Representation Section
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

Gene P. Belardi Vice President MobileMedia Communications, Inc. 2101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 935 Arlington, Virginia 22201 Susan Drombetta
Manager-Rates and Tariffs
Scherers Communications Group, Inc.
575 Scherers Court
Worthington, OH 43085

M. Robert Sutherland
Theodore R. Kingsley
Attorneys for BellSouth Corporation and Bell South
Telecommunications, Inc.
Suite 1700
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3610

Werner K. Hartenberger, Esq.
J.G. Harrington, Esq.
Laura H. Phillips, Esq.
Cox Enterprises
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson,
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036